

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
9

10 STEVEN GEORGE FAIR,)
11 Plaintiff,) Case No. CV07-1070-HU
12 vs.)
13 SPORTSMANS WAREHOUSE et al.) OPINION AND
14 Defendants.) ORDER
15

16 KING, District Judge:

17 George Fair has filed an application to proceed without
18 prepayment of fees.

19 The application recites that in 2003, Fair tendered "250.00
20 silver specie Coin Dollars Legal Tender of the united States of
21 America and Eagles" to the district court "upon the order of Ancer
22 Haggerty for an action." Application, p. 1. The application
23 continues,

24 It was reported by the clerk of the court that Mr.
25 Haggerty did engage a metals speculator to exchange the
26 money having congressional 'Value' for valueless federal
27 reserve notes via what appeared to be unjust enrichment
and illicit gain. Reality is that a corporate
enfranchisee was required to tender 250 valueless federal
reserve notes for justice, and Plaintiff was required to

1 tender 250 Dollars as legislatively defined by Congress
2 for 'Value' for the several States Union, Article I, sec.
3 8, cls. 5. Ancer Haggerty did speculate with a metals
4 trader with said silver specie money of We the People and
5 create between 1000 and 1600 federal reserve notes as a
tally in unbalanced books. The chief judge of the 9th
circuit refused to sanction Mr. Haggerty in a slam
patriot dunk. Nor would congress, or the General
Accounting Office sanction Mr. Haggerty.

6 Id. at 1-2. The application states further that Fair cannot, in
7 good conscience, "Tender silver specie Coin Legal Tender from the
8 Mint because he has been destroyed by the democracy's use of Nash's
9 Non Co-operative Game theory abuse via the Banking Act of 1913 and
10 Nixon destruction of the base 'value' for the Currency Cases which
11 established that a Federal Reserve Note could be exchanged for a
12 Thing that could be exchanged for a Dollar quid pro quo."

13 Mr. Fair's submission states that he is not currently
14 employed, but that at some unspecified time he "took benefit of
15 approximately 1800 frn tally per month gross gain, Rainbow
16 Finishes, Oregon City, Oregon." The application states further that
17 he has no rents, interest or dividends, no pensions, annuities, or
18 "limited liability insurance," no "benefit of this state,
19 disability or compensation," no gifts or inheritances, and no other
20 sources of money. Fair states further that he has no checking or
21 savings as "no bank opens an account for someone who the federal
22 union of states will not represent SSN via SS-5." Plaintiff states
23 that he owns \$21 and a 1931 Chrysler worth approximately \$200 and
24 that he supports "no Man, Woman, or Child."

25 An examination of Mr. Fair's application indicates that he is
26 unable to afford the costs of this action. Accordingly, IT IS
27

1 ORDERED that the provisional *in forma pauperis* status given the
2 plaintiff is confirmed. This action may go forward without the
3 payment of fees or costs. However, for the reasons set forth
4 below, plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed, without service of
5 process, on the basis that it fails to state a claim.

6 The caption on the first document filed this case shows three
7 different case numbers, two from the District of Oregon, 07-9115-
8 KI, and the present case, 07-1070-HU. The third case number in the
9 caption is designated as one for the United States District Court
10 for Colorado, 07-1271-WDM.

11 In case No. 07-9115-KI, the named parties are plaintiff Steven
12 George Fair and Sportsmans Warehouse, Stephen C. LeBlanc, Angler
13 Art, and Ducks Unlimited as defendants. The case was commenced by
14 means of a document filed by plaintiff on May 16, 2007, identified
15 as a "Motion for Pre-Complaint Discovery." (Doc. # 1). I denied the
16 motion on May 25, 2007, (doc. # 2), and denied plaintiff's Motion
17 for Reconsideration on June 21, 2007 (doc. # 4).

18 The parties named in this case, 07-1070-HU, are plaintiff Fair
19 and defendants Sportsmans Warehouse, Stephen LeBlanc, Stuart
20 Utgaard, and John Does 1-99. The initiating document filed in this
21 case is designated as a "Motion to Join Actions." Other documents
22 are attached to the motion to join actions, designated as "Special
23 Matter FRAP Rule 9," and "Motion to Dismiss FRAP Rule 12."

24 The motion to join actions recites as follows:

- 25 1. Plaintiff sent four pictures of his sculptures to Stu
26 Utgaard, after Mr. Utgaard was recommended to plaintiff
27

1 by a Sportsmans Warehouse manager during a show in Reno,
2 Nevada.

3 2. Plaintiff subsequently discovered a sculpture titled "I'm
4 the Boss," in front of the Sportsmans Warehouse store in
5 Portland, Oregon. The sculpture had a bronze plate
6 attributing the sculpture to Stephen LeBlanc.

7 3. Plaintiff sent an e-mail to LeBlanc with the statement
8 that he believed "I'm the Boss" and another sculpture,
9 "The Challenger," infringed plaintiff's sculpture "Royal
10 Entrance."

11 4. Mr. LeBlanc responded that plaintiff's sculpture was an
12 infringement of LeBlanc's piece titled "Looking for
13 Trouble."

14 5. Sportsmans Warehouse filed a complaint in the United
15 States District Court for the District of Colorado, a
16 complaint that "remains deficient pursuant to Plaintiff's
17 motions under FRAP 9 and FRAP 12 no matter how many times
18 it is illegitimately served by process server in abuse of
19 Rule 4 causing substantive injury and interference with
20 International Trade."

21 6. "[t]he action before the U.S. District Court for the
22 District of Colorado appears as an illegitimate action
23 attempting to circumvent defendants' trespass on Oregon
24 with "I'm the Boss." Plaintiff's Oregon Action has
25 precedence and is superior to all of defendants' abuse of
26 Rule 4, including falsification of service of summons
27

1 that never occurred in Oregon."

2 7. "Defendants know that Plaintiff, as the Sovereign, cannot
3 enter into commercial aircraft for travel because he
4 takes benefit of no corporate 28 U.S.C. 3001(15) I.D., or
5 I.D. from the federal district of Oregon territorial
6 power under Article I, sec. 8, cls. 17, and/or Article
7 IV, sec. 3, cls. 2."

8 As relief, plaintiff seeks to "join Plaintiff's Complaint, and
9 defendants illegitimate actions in the Federal district Court for
10 Oregon so as to prevent a substantive loss of Endowments and Due
11 Process secured in allodium in Plaintiff."

12 Other documents attached to the motion to join are a motion
13 requesting a stay of the actions of the Colorado District Court
14 "until such time as the Oregon Court, and the Colorado court
15 determine the proper seat for this controversy," and a "Demand for
16 the court to order plaintiff to involuntary political status in
17 violation of Title 8 United States Code." This latter demand states
18 that

19 Due to Plaintiff's deeply held religious beliefs and
20 training, Plaintiff believes that the names used by
21 defendants LeBlanc and Sportsmans Warehouse in their
22 various complaints are attempts at corporate conversion
23 via roman civil law, and the voluntary political act 14th
24 amendment for congressional legislative slaves resident
25 over the several States upon a skulduggery called
26 'district of Oregon' 'district of Colorado' ie; federal
27 14th amendment corporate enfranchisee citizenship within
28 the district of Columbia, and residence for corporate
29 business in one of the 'zones' created by the
30 Reconstruction Acts of 1867.

31 Title 8 Motion, ¶ 1. The document asks that this court

32 ///

1 create a Title 8 Controversy by Order compelling
2 Plaintiff to Answer for an illegitimate corporate
3 enfranchisee STEPHEN G. FAIR, or Order defendants to
4 amend their complaints and file them in the district
5 Court for the united States of America Oregon as the
6 conditions precedent of the prior and supersedeous case
7 filed by Steven George Fair prior to this fallacious
8 Motion for Declaratory Judgment in the federal
9 territorial district of Colorado by abuse of corporate
10 power.

11 Id. at ¶ 5.

12 Pursuant to the federal *in forma pauperis* statute, codified at
13 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), the court is authorized to dismiss an *in forma*
14 *pauperis* complaint before service of process if satisfied that the
15 action fails to state a claim for which relief may be granted, or
16 is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii); Neitzke v.
17 Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989). A complaint is frivolous "where
18 it lacks an arguable basis in law or in fact." Id. at 325.

19 The court construes plaintiff's motion to join actions as a
20 request to consolidate the Colorado action and the present action.
21 The court has no discretion to consolidate an action in the
22 District of Oregon with an action in the District of Colorado, and
23 declines to do so. Compare Investors Research Co. v. United States
24 District Court for the Central District of California, 877 F.2d 777
25 (9th Cir. 1989) (district court has broad discretion to consolidate
26 cases pending in the same district).

27 Plaintiff's filings in the present case do not indicate the
28 nature of the Colorado action, the alignment of the parties, or its
procedural posture. This court has no means of determining whether
Sportsmans Warehouse, LeBlanc, or Utgaard, the named defendants in
this case, or defendants "John Doe 1-99," are subject to personal

1 jurisdiction in the District of Oregon, or whether venue is
2 properly laid in this district.

3 Plaintiff's filing captioned "Demand for the court to order
4 plaintiff to involuntary political status in violation of Title 8
5 United States Code" is frivolous and without merit.

6 The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is GRANTED; the motion
7 to join actions is DENIED. The motion dealing with ordering
8 plaintiff to involuntary political status is DENIED. The action is
9 dismissed without prejudice.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11
12 Dated this __22nd__ day of October, 2007.

13 /s/ Garr M. King

14 _____
15 Garr M. King
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27